

**APPENDIX B**  
**Submitted Written Public Comments\***

(Additional Written Public Comments from the February 23, 2005 Meeting may be  
found on the 911 Environmental Action Website:  
<http://911ea.org>)

**\*THE FOLLOWING PUBLIC COMMENTS WERE RECEIVED AT THE  
EXPERT TECHNICAL PANEL REVIEW MEETING #9. NOTE, THE  
MEETING IS NOT A PUBLIC HEARING TO HEAR TESTIMONY, BUT  
RATHER A TECHNICAL MEETING FOR EXPERT PANEL MEMBER  
DISCUSSIONS WITH TIME SET ASIDE TO HEAR COMMENTS FROM THE  
PUBLIC ON DISCUSSION TOPICS.**

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:**

February 23, 2005

**FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Suzanne Mattei, 347-277-1415 (cell)

**SIERRA CLUB URGES EPA TO DESIGN ITS NEW WTC CLEANUP PROGRAM  
TO FIND ALL OF THE 9/11 CONTAMINATION AND CLEAN IT UP**

Suzanne Mattei, the New York City Executive for the Sierra Club, which has over 14,000 members in New York City, provided testimony today at the EPA World Trade Center Expert Technical Review Panel in support of the WTC Community-Labor Coalition's expert witness, Dr. David Carpenter of the University at Albany. She emphasized the following:

"It is important to remember at all times what brought us together in this effort. We are discussing how the federal government should respond to a terrorist assault on innocent civilians that unleashed a scourge of toxic contamination"

"The federal government should seek to find and remove all of the 9/11 pollution that remains in homes or workplaces and may present a risk to human health. The goal should not be to find as little as possible or to do as little as possible. EPA should design this testing program to protect human health."

"The need for such protection is great. This Panel has heard extensive testimony about the contamination of both homes and workplaces with World Trade Center dust. It has heard not only individual statements about persistent 9/11 health effects, but also scientific documentation."

"We object to EPA's plan to use three times the background level as the trigger for cleanup of asbestos, man-made vitreous fibers, and silica. Osama Bin Laden should not be allowed to triple the level of pollution in our homes and workplaces. The Expert Advisory Group urges a more careful review of this benchmark. It also criticizes using high measurements of toxic substances in urban areas as 'background' since such contamination usually indicates the presence of an unknown pollution source."

"While the discussion of the so-called 'signature' for identifying World Trade Center dust has been couched as a scientific issue, it is also a policy issue – because it goes to the question of who cleans up contamination when it is found. There is some concern that EPA may have a financial motivation to limit the scope of the 'signature' as much as possible, so that it would be responsible for as few as possible of the cleanups. This would work an injustice on the public."

"Any 'signature' must be flexible enough to consider the likely mixing of ordinary dust with World Trade Center dust, the heterogeneous nature of the World Trade Center dust itself, and the likelihood that the content of the dust cloud probably varied with deposition distance,

since different substances and particle sizes have varying abilities to travel. It would be wrong to define the "signature" so narrowly that individual owners or tenants are left with the task of cleaning up pollution that came from the attack and rightly should be remediated by the federal government."

"The standard for cleanup should not – and probably cannot – be absolute 'certainty' of 9/11 origin. A standard of 'more likely than not' would be much more reasonable. The community should not be penalized for lack of absolute certainty in 'signature' identification. We should all assume that we are not going to find absolute certainty three years after the attack, and instead focus on the goal of protecting the public from any further exposure to 9/11 pollution."

"EPA's sampling plan states that it will test for lead dust only on hard surfaces, using wipe samples. This does not make sense. If the source is World Trade Center dust, then sampling on frequently cleaned hard surfaces three years after the attack might not always reveal its presence. Soft surfaces, in contrast, are very likely to harbor World Trade Center lead dust. Lead can easily become embedded in carpets and soft furniture. This is one of the most likely locations to find World Trade Center lead dust today, and it presents a special exposure risk to infants and toddlers. EPA must not ignore soft surfaces when sampling for lead in an apartment."

"This panel has heard many examples of improper work practices that occurred during the 2002 cleanup program. Sierra Club documented many serious flaws and failures of that cleanup program in its 2004 report, *Pollution and Deception at Ground Zero*. Quality assurance and quality control will be key to building public confidence in this new World Trade Center contamination cleanup project."

"Finally, in addition to public confidence in both the design and implementation of EPA's testing program, the Sierra Club emphasizes that the ultimate success of this project will depend upon:

- (b) an aggressive, well-designed and fully funded outreach program to encourage public participation and

- (c) an explicit public commitment from the federal government to conduct cleanup when contaminants are discovered. (The Expert Advisory Group strongly agrees with the importance of an advance commitment to cleanup.)

Thank you for considering this testimony."

Testimony to WTC Expert Panel 2/23/05

From: Caroline Martin – Family Association of Tribeca East

The Family Association of Tribeca East represents about 20 buildings south of Canal Street and east of West Broadway.

## 1. Demolitions:

There is a very active and inclusive residents and workers 'WTC Community/Labor coalition' group, part of a CBPR process funded by EPA. It is thus extremely disrespectful for EPA to have a closed meeting with CB#1 to discuss triggers for evacuation. It is horrifying, given what we know about the toxics in 130 Liberty, to hear that EPA seems to have convinced the president of CB#1 that we will need 'a few days' of exceedances of contaminants before community notification is necessary. Can EPA explain their reasoning behind this position and does the panel endorse it?

At the City Council meeting on 2/17, EPA talked regularly about evacuating workers in the event of a trigger, but nothing about warnings or evacuations of anybody else. Is that because you plan to leave us all in situ for a few days of toxic release? Perhaps you plan to alert us by regular mail?

At the 2/17 meeting, Councilman Gerson requested that EPA provide him with the list of the contaminants and trigger levels they approved for the demolition of 4 Albany. Has EPA provided him with those documents?

It has long been LMDC's position that no new EIS is necessary for the demolition at 130 Liberty. However, the only haz mats that are mentioned in the GEIS for the WTC site are carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, VOCs, ozone, lead, p.m. 2.5 & 10 and sulfur dioxide. Given what is now known about 130 Liberty, does EPA still think that no new EIS is required?

## 2. Testing and Clean-up

The family Association of Tribeca East endorses the WTC Community/Labor comments on the draft sampling proposal. We particularly want to endorse a need for the EPA to provide in writing a detailed rationale for the 'triggers' for cleanup, and why it was decided not to include particulate mercury and dioxin in the proposed contaminants for sampling. We would like to add beryllium

We want to re-iterate that EPA is funding the Community/Labor CBPR process. Will you please pay attention to us and our expert advisory committee.

It has been brought to my attention today that not one request for additional funds for this testing and cleaning program has ever been made. You don't know how much money might be available. Under these circumstances, how can you in good conscience restrict your efforts to the currently available \$7 million?

When my son was twelve, he wanted to be a magician. As he went through his sorcerer's apprenticeship, I picked up some tricks of the trade. Number One was, when you're doing sleight of hand over here, what you must say is, "Look over there!"

So it is with averaging. Averaging is the trick of seeing a spike over here and saying, "Look over there!" Just find another area with no spike, average them out and Poof! The problem has vanished.

Our experts have made clear why, when averaging is appropriate to use at a superfund site, it is not so appropriate in an apartment building. If 3B is contaminated and 10F is not, it makes no sense to average them out and let the people in 3B die young.

On the subject of the demolitions downtown: Dr. Oppelt, I was disturbed to hear you say that this was beyond the mandate of the panel. Under the rubric of unmet public health need, it falls squarely within the mandate of the panel and is of critical importance.

LMDC, the City Council and this panel have held hearings on these and the same points need to be made in each venue:

1. OSHA action levels for lead have been exceeded at 130 Liberty St. yet so far as we know, no action was taken. The levels simply get posted to the website.
2. At the City Council hearing, Kevin Rampe spoke of applying for variances. This is troubling because a variance is what you seek when you want to avoid a regulation.
3. We've made some progress on Deutsche Bank but even as we speak, 4 Albany Street is being demolished. This has a private owner who is not subject to the same kind of public process requirements as a state agency. Nevertheless the public has a right to know how the demolition is proceeding. We have reason to fear it may fall short of what's necessary to protect the public health. This panel should look into that ASAP.
4. On the subject of EPA's "taking the lead: "They've adopted the phrase but gutted it of meaning. We mean by it that they should be the ultimate authority with responsibility for the demolition. What they're actually doing is keeping busy getting other agencies to be in charge. EPA has adopted an ever-so-polite stance of "DOL, you're such great experts in asbestos and you, DOH, are the authorities on lead; you must of course take the lead." Then when it's time for the lawsuits we'll have a room full of agencies pointing fingers at each other. That's what EPA is counting on.

Politeness is fine in a business as usual situation but this is not business as usual. It's a potential public health emergency and you need to rise to the occasion.

Jenna Orkin  
World Trade Center Environmental Organization

**STATEMENT OF ROBERT GULACK, UNION STEWARD,  
U.S. SECURITIES & EXCHANGE COMMISSION,  
AT THE EPA TECHNICAL REVIEW PANEL**

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

February 23, 2005

**FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:**

Robert Gulack, (201) 794-9322

With regard to the EPA's "voluntary" testing proposal, the question here is not, as the EPA keeps saying, whether we are somehow going to impose testing on non-volunteers. The question is whether we are going to allow landlords and employers to deny testing to workers who wish to volunteer and residents who want public spaces tested. I would appreciate it if the EPA would stop trying to confuse and mislead people on this issue.

It's very simple. To the EPA, "voluntary" means that people with a financial motive to hide World Trade Center debris – landlords and employers – have the right to say no, and people who are trying to protect their health – employees and residents – have no right to say yes. That is what "voluntary" means when you work at the EPA.

Abraham Lincoln once said that Douglas' Popular Sovereignty amounted to nothing more than saying, "If A wishes to enslave B, then neither B nor anyone else has any right to object." The EPA's doctrine of "voluntary" testing amounts to nothing more than this: "If a landlord or employer wishes to subject tenants or employees to World Trade Center debris, neither those tenants or employees nor anyone else has any right to object."

Six months ago, Dr. Lioy asked the EPA for a legal memo regarding the right of workers and residents to call for testing. Have you received it? No. What possible excuse can the EPA offer for its failure to respond to this basic and necessary request? Let me ask the EPA: Have your computers been down for six months? Have your lawyers all been on vacation? Did the puppy chew up your homework? Do you think that you can hide the truth from this panel by failing to give them the memo? This panel already knows the truth. They know that Governor Pataki has the legal power to allow any worker or resident to volunteer his workspace or apartment building for testing.

That being said, let's quickly review where we are. First, we heard in *The New York Times* about hundreds of students at Stuyvesant High School falling ill. Then the Mount Sinai doctors reported they had treated thousands of victims harmed, like me, because, on the advice of the EPA, these citizens went back to contaminated offices and homes. Now, we learn from Dr. Joan Reibman's New York University School of Medicine study that the true number of injured residents probably numbers in the tens of thousands. The wave of preventable casualties is breaking over our heads like a tsunami, and the EPA stands there, among the wet wreckage, telling the *New York Post*, "We don't know whether there is any World Trade Center contamination." First, if there's no contamination, what's causing all these casualties? Second, if the Department of Defense told the press, "We don't know whether a Russian nuclear attack is in progress," the response would be, "It's your *job* to know. That's what we *pay* you to know. It's not good enough to say, 'Gee, I don't know.'" Under Presidential Decision Directive 62, it is the EPA's job to lead the response to terrorist attacks. On its face, the EPA's response that, after three years, it still doesn't know the effect of the Sept. 11 attacks proves that the EPA has failed to perform its legally mandated duties.

In October, I warned this panel that you were being used by a gang of self-interested political hacks to perpetrate an electoral fraud on the American people. I predicted that, if Bush were returned to power, these political hacks would see no further need for your services. Well, what actually happened? The very day it was announced that Bush had been returned to power, Dr. Gilman resigned from this panel. For month after month after month, the EPA refused to appoint a successor to Dr. Gilman. Indeed, as we just heard today, we still don't have a permanent chairman. For month after month after month, the EPA refused to allow this panel to meet under the leadership of Dr. Lioy – perhaps because Dr. Lioy now favors immediate testing in Brooklyn and using the full legal powers of all the relevant agencies to allow workers and residents to call for testing. Time has not stood still. Outside this room, demolition work has been going forward at 4 Albany Street, exposing construction workers, residents, and local employees to unknown hazards. Outside this room, the Sept. 11 debris has continued to poison thousands more innocent New Yorkers. But you have not been allowed to meet from early November till now. You have been shoved aside and kept out of the process, denied the opportunity to hear urgent appeals for testing from the political representatives of Brooklyn. Neither have you been informed whether you will be permitted to meet next month. You provided them with political cover; they were allowed to prolong their cover-up till the election. In their eyes, they have squeezed the juice out of you and you are now a dispensable pile of peels.

The EPA has the same contempt for you that they have for the EPA Inspector General and Senator Clinton and Congressman Nadler and Congresswoman Maloney and Congressman Owens and Councilman Yassky and the unanimous Community Boards of lower Manhattan. They have the same contempt for the 50 unions and local groups that joined in the call for a clean-up. Let there be no doubt in the minds of this panel – the democratically elected representatives of New York City do not support the EPA's testing proposal. They have said so in press conference after press conference. The fact that the elected representatives of the people of New York have unanimously rejected this proposal ought to count for something in a country that is still supposed to be a democracy. Just last Thursday, two members of the New York City Council stated, on the record, that the EPA had lied to New York City and the EPA representative responding to those comments, Pat Evangelista, did not even attempt to deny it. Pat Evangelista is as well aware that the EPA has been lying as I am, and as is everyone else in this room.

When, in the fall of 2001, their asbestos consultants warned them they were ignoring 90% of the World Trade Center asbestos, the EPA fired their asbestos consultants, H.P. Environmental of Virginia. When, in October 2001, the *New York Daily News* dared to report on this issue, Mayor Giuliani's office called the paper. The editor responsible was demoted to reporter. The investigative team was disassembled and assigned elsewhere. When the EPA ombudsman tried to warn about this crisis, he was fired and his office shut down. When the EPA Inspector General sought to warn the country about what was going on, she was personally attacked and her recommendations ignored. Whoever stands in their way is hacked to pieces, with all the delicacy and respect for democratic principles once displayed by Genghis Khan.

Let me venture two more brief predictions, since my October prediction turned out so well.

First, the EPA will shove to one side all the protests from the community and its unanimous elected representatives. The EPA will go forward with a fraudulent testing procedure that relies on landlord cooperation. The EPA will not get the cooperation. Then the EPA will announce there will be no testing due to the failure of landlords to cooperate. All of your work for the last year will be thrown in the garbage. After all, the EPA just used this tactic with the other agencies involved in the Deutsche Bank demolition. Instead of citing the EPA's legal

authority, and ordering cooperation, the EPA asked for voluntary cooperation. When the EPA failed to get that voluntary cooperation from the other agencies, the EPA lied and said there was nothing more they could do.

My second prediction is even more simple, and is grounded in my fundamental faith in my country and her people. *This flimsy cover-up will not stand.* One day, the American people will learn the truth. And, when that occurs, all who have participated in this three-year cover-up will not only be disgraced. They will be *reviled*. History will record that when America was attacked, they refused to clean up al-Qa'ida's chemical weapons; that the EPA sat there, year after year after year, and forced our innocent children to inhale and ingest lethal contaminants.

Let me address the panel: No fate could be worse than to be seen as siding with such people. Stand up now and denounce them. Call a press conference on your own authority. Stand side by side with the Sierra Club and the EPA Inspector General and Senator Clinton and Congressman Nadler and tell the American people that the EPA's plan for testing only when landlords volunteer is unacceptable and designed to fail. Tell the American people you will have no part of it. For God's sake, tell them what side you are on. Otherwise, for the rest of your lives, you will be left trying to explain what happened here. You will be left trying to explain to your children why you let this happen to everyone else's children. For the rest of your lives, people will thrust dying children at you and say, "You did this to my daughter. You did this to my son." I beg you, don't put yourselves in that position. You will regret it every day for the rest of your lives.

If you stand up against the EPA in public, you will win. If the history of our precious nation teaches us anything, it is that one free American, fighting openly and publicly on his own soil for the safety of his children, is worth more than one thousand purchased mercenaries.



Testimony to EPA World Trade Center Expert Panel  
February 23, 2005 meeting  
Marjorie J. Clarke, Ph.D.

Thank you for the opportunity to present comments on the proceedings of this panel. I am still wondering whether all the powerpoint presentations that have been given at the panel meetings will be accessible at the EPA website for this panel. Will these be on the website soon?

I was thinking about Dr. David Prezant's opinion that the science should not be compromised by expanding the geographic area for sampling since that would necessitate reducing the density of samples taken from sites closest to Ground Zero. I agree that the sampling protocol and ultimately, the cleanup protocol, should not be compromised in any way for any reason. I'm very aware of all the time and effort that the entire panel has been expending on these discussions. I know that each and every one of the panel members want to maximize the utility of their efforts on the ground once the work of the panel is done and EPA starts sampling and cleaning. But I see that the panel members are twisting themselves into knots, and I fear that the tenor of the discussions and potentially the decisions made about the sampling / cleaning protocols are being driven by cost considerations.

I am sure that all of the panel members want to do a complete, scientifically valid sampling program and to clean up buildings when contamination is found. Since the direction of discussions and the final protocols can result in a perversion of the science and a suboptimal program design with similar results, if there is a specific, and low cap on costs, makes sense for the panel to make an interim recommendation, that only a very limited protocol is possible unless more money is forthcoming.

You may recall that the original charge for the panel was far narrower than the current mission has become, hence the funding available was small. If the panel continues to shackle itself to a tiny budget, it will come up with recommendations for sampling, but won't these be even more pathetic than the maid service that the EPA sent in to volunteer apartments in 2002? After all, that program, which serviced only a fifth of the residences in a small area, leaving businesses and institutions untouched, expended \$30 million and this program currently has only \$6 or \$7 million allocated. What is the current mission of the panel? Is it to use a pre-determined \$6-7 million in the best way? Or do we want to characterize and quantify the FULL extent of WTC contamination, and clean it up? Please consider issuing an Interim Finding and Recommendation asking for sufficient funding to accomplish the mission, so that the panel's future deliberations might be unfettered by cost considerations.

Statement  
of  
Stanley Mark  
On Behalf of  
Asian American Legal Defense  
and Education Fund  
submitted  
to  
WTC Expert Technical  
Review Panel

Convened  
February 23, 2005  
Saval Auditorium  
St. John's University  
New York, NY 10013

AALDEF  
99 Hudson Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10013  
212-966-5932  
[smark@aaldef.org](mailto:smark@aaldef.org)

(Since I was unable to speak due to insufficient time allocated for public comments, I submitting this statement and my comments in writing for the record. I did speak from the floor to the panel during the EPA presentation on Themes from Public Comments and have incorporated my oral comments into this written statement.)

#### Introduction

My name is Stanley Mark and I am the Program Director and an attorney at the Asian American Legal Defense and Education Fund (AALDEF). My office fully endorses the community comments scientifically supported by a team of experts coordinated by Dr. David Carpenter who presented his findings and recommendations this morning on the EPA's "Draft Proposed Sampling Program to Determine Extent of World Trade Center Impacts to the Indoor Environment."

#### Background

AALDEF is located 9 blocks north of Ground Zero and 5 blocks south of Canal Street that has served as an arbitrary boundary for 9/11 relief programs. My office has represented and assisted thousands of Lower Manhattan residents seeking relief assistance including families who lost loved ones at Ground Zero. Most of my clients live in Chinatown and the Lower East Side while some reside in Brooklyn and New Jersey and work in Manhattan. Many of whom are enduring respiratory problems, skin rashes, stomach problems, anxiety, and other illnesses resulting from the 9/11 attacks.

In early 2004, AALDEF along with members of the Beyond Ground Zero network (BGZ) started a joint clinic with Bellevue Hospital with the assistance of Dr. Joan Reibman to treat many residents in the Lower East Side and Chinatown. In the first months of 2004, BGZ members and AALDEF staff had escorted more than 100 patients to obtain medical treatment at Bellevue Hospital for 9/11 related illnesses, many of whom do not live within the arbitrary boundaries of the 9/11 relief programs. Most if not all the relief assistance program had set Canal Street as the northern border (including the WTC Health Registry, a program that does not provide medical treatment).

#### Geographical Scope of Sampling and Clean Up

Just before Dr. Paul Gilman resigned at the end of November 2004 as Chair of the EPA Technical Review Panel, he informed me that there are no data to support Canal Street or Houston Street as the northern boundary for test sampling. He also mentioned that buildings Brooklyn would not be included in the first phase of the program. In order to address access to government buildings at today's panel, a representative from the US Government Services Administration (GSA) is present. If the GSA can help gain access for sampling and a clean up of federal buildings in lower Manhattan, GSA should do the same for federal buildings in Brooklyn in all phases of the proposed plan. For example, the US District Court Eastern District is located on the other side of the Brooklyn Bridge at Cadman Plaza. Furthermore, Dr. Carpenter recommends that a clean up be conducted for all areas affected by the plume and the fire at Ground Zero.

Furthermore, according to 2 recently published studies about

environmental health impacts due to the toxic fallout of 9/11, one by Dr. Joan Reibman and the other by Dr. Anthony Szema, the documented medical impact extended in 5 mile radii from Ground Zero and covered a minimum area of 78.6 square miles with Ground Zero as the center. Dr. Reibman's study encompasses residents living in Smith Projects, Chatham Towers, and Chatham Green located in Chinatown and the Lower East Side as well as Battery Park City in the west side of lower Manhattan. Her study demonstrated a 3-fold increase of respiratory illnesses characterized as new onset of asthma. Dr. Szema's study focused on more than 200 Chinese children who were treated for asthma before and after the 9/11 attacks by the same doctors. His study showed that both the number of doctor visits and the doses of asthma medication increased in a statistically significant manner for children living within a 5 mile radius from Ground Zero.

Without data from representative sampling (proper standard monitoring of air, water, and dust samples) in the weeks and months following the 9/11 tragedy, the EPA had declared the air safe. The Centers for Disease Control made no pronouncements to physicians about how to treat victims of WTC fallout while the state and local health departments failed to declare a public health emergency. As a result, federal government agencies must now be held accountable. The appropriate agencies must allocate sufficient financial resources for the clean up of Lower Manhattan and Brooklyn and provide health coverage for medical treatment for all who are affected by the 9/11 toxic fallout.

#### Conclusion

In the absence of representative sampling, these two recent studies documenting the environmental health impacts strongly suggest that the minimum geographical area for clean up would be at least 78.6 square miles with Ground Zero as the center. With more research and medical studies yielding statistically significant data, the 5 mile radii could be extended further and enlarge the findings of health impacts covering a larger area as a minimum area for clean-up.

## Testimony to be given at EPA hearing #9

We need an authentic lead agent for the demolition phase of the WTC rebuild. Up to now, the community has endured an ad hoc lead agency that is neither Federal nor State. At it's best, LMDC is certainly not prone to emphasizing community health and welfare. Worse, now, LMDC proves to be lacking the power to properly carry out the required demolitions without EPA involvement. Of course, the LMDC had no prior knowledge of the extent of toxic contamination at 130 Liberty. None of us did.

But, months after they wrote the GEIS as a third party, the LMDC came to possess and insure 130 Liberty. Under these fresh circumstances and because of the findings that are coming to light about the dangers of WTC toxins, LMDC can not be expected to neutrally determine whether an additional environmental impact statement is required.

And another question arises: Would it be a conflict of interest for the LMDC to continue to act as the lead agency if it spins-off the deconstruction of at least 130 Liberty to EPA?

We are confused. We seem to have three options: irrationally segment the project or LMDC leads or EPA leads. We are in the first state "irrational segmentation." However, at any point, LMDC could be granted federal powers to remedy the toxic sites under NEPA or be entirely substituted out by EPA. The first position would avoid the handing off of a partial, condemned section and leave LMDC in the lead of an entire, integrated project. The second and preferable would bring leadership, resources and cautions to an entire, integrated project and handle the contaminants as they merit. Either position would eliminate the innervating "hot potato" appearance of the 130 Liberty that we see now.

If the Deutsche Bank is so contaminated as to require the EPA's involvement, then, the entire WTC rebuild project should come under that Agency. If the LMDC is to continue as Lead Agency then, 130 Liberty and other demolitions must be carried out under NEPA. Under either circumstance, we need a firm commitment to our health and safety, from a responsible lead agent.

**Diane Dreyfus, M.S. Arch.**  
**Little Italy Neighbors Association**  
253 Elizabeth NYC 10012 – 917-254-9851  
diane\_dreyfus@UTECHO.com

PEF Division 199  
P.O. Box 7478, JAF Station  
New York, NY 10116-7478  
(212) 268-6738

EPA WTC Expert Technical Review Panel Comments

February 23, 2005

### **The EPA Should Do Much More**

(To the tune of "Get Me to the Church On Time")

#### **Words by Paul Stein**

(Health & Safety Chairperson,  
New York State Public Employees  
Federation, Division 199)

(Chorus)

We live and work all day in Downtown.  
Ground Zero's sitting right next door.  
We fear air pollution.  
A partial solution -  
The EPA should do much more.

Extensive testing's a decent start,  
But it's useless if you skip the cleanup part. (Chorus)

The Deutsche Bank will soon be torn down.  
What happens if its toxic insides blow around? (Chorus)

Contamination's our sorry plight,  
So much we should be labeled a HAZWOPER site. (Chorus)

Fiterman Hall gapes in open view.  
If you like to breathe dioxin, it's for you. (Chorus)

The toxic plume struck in Brooklyn too.  
A testing plan and cleanup there is overdue. (Chorus)

The Freedom Tower's about to rise.  
With all the dirt and fumes a billion dollars buys. (Chorus)

LMDC says they deconstruct.  
If things go wrong, we say we'll all be . . . sorry. (Chorus)